



absence of objections to the R & R, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge's recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199–200 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation’” (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note)).

Having reviewed the record for clear error, the Court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's R & R [ECF No. 17] *as modified below*.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, the Court **DISMISSES** this case *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process.<sup>4</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Florence, South Carolina  
April 20, 2020

s/ R. Bryan Harwell  
R. Bryan Harwell  
Chief United States District Judge

---

<sup>3</sup> The Court modifies the caption to describe the parties as named in Plaintiff's Amended Complaint. *See* ECF No. 13. Additionally, the Court notes Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction [ECF No. 5] is **MOOT**.

<sup>4</sup> The Magistrate Judge provided Plaintiff an opportunity to file an amended complaint, which he did. *See* ECF Nos. 10 & 13; *see generally Goode v. Cent. Virginia Legal Aid Soc'y, Inc.*, 807 F.3d 619, 623 (4th Cir. 2015). The Court is dismissing this action without prejudice based on lack of subject matter jurisdiction. *See S. Walk at Broadlands Homeowner's Ass'n, Inc. v. OpenBand at Broadlands, LLC*, 713 F.3d 175, 185 (4th Cir. 2013) (“[D]ismissals for lack of jurisdiction should be without prejudice because the court, having determined that it lacks jurisdiction over the action, is incapable of reaching a disposition on the merits of the underlying claims.” (alteration in original) (citation omitted)); *Norton v. Columbus Cty. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 736 F. App'x 406, 407 (4th Cir. 2018) (indicating a dismissal based on the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine should be without prejudice).